

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

THOMAS C. GOLDSTEIN,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Criminal Case No. 8:25-cr-00006-LKG

Dated: April 14, 2025

ORDER

Upon reviewing the Government's consent motion to exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act (ECF No. 109) the Court finds that: (1) under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h), the interests of justice will be served by continuing the trial date beyond the speedy trial date and (2) the ends of justice served by such a delay in the trial of this case outweigh the interests of the public and the Defendant in a speedy trial. Specifically, the Court concludes that:

- a. The failure to grant this request in this proceeding would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice;
- b. The requested exclusion of time would allow the Defendant the opportunity to finalize arrangements regarding his representation, for the Government to produce and the Defense to review voluminous discovery, and for the parties to discuss a potential resolution of this case or otherwise prepare for pretrial motions and trial; and
- c. The failure to set trial beyond the speedy trial date in this proceeding would deny counsel for the Defendant and the Government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, considering the exercise of due diligence.

And so, it is hereby ORDERED on this 14th day of April, 2025 that:

1. The Government's Consent Motion is **GRANTED**;
2. The period from **March 28, 2025, to January 12, 2026**, shall be excluded from calculation under the Speedy Trial Act;
3. The interests of justice will be served by continuing the trial date beyond the speedy trial

date; and

4. The ends of justice served by such a delay in the trial of this case outweigh the interests of the public and the Defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Lydia Kay Griggsby
LYDIA KAY GRIGGSBY
United States District Judge